

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT

ENDC/PV.393
27 August 1968
ENGLISH

STATE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

NOV 20 1968

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND NINETY-THIRD MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 27 August 1968, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. A.F. AZEREDO da SILVEIRA (Brazil)

GE.68-16230

68-20714

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A.F. AZEREDO da SILVEIRA
Mr. A. da COSTA GUIMARAES
Mr. L.F. PALMEIRA LAMPREIA

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. CHRISTOV
Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV

Burma:

U CHIT MYAING
U KYAW MIN

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
Mr. A.G. CAMPBELL
Mr. J.R. MORDEN

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. T. LAHODA
Mr. R. KLEIN
Mr. J. STRUCKA

Ethiopia:

Mr. A. ZELLEKE

India:

Mr. M.A. HUSAIN
Mr. N. KRISHNAN
Mr. K.P. JAIN

Italy:

Mr. R. CARACCIOLI
Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI
Mr. R. BORSARELLI
Mr. R. BERLENGHI

Mexico:

Mr. H. CARDENAS RODRIGUEZ

Nigeria:

Alhaji SULE KOLO
Mr. L.A. MALIKI

Poland:

Mr. H. JAROSZEK

Mr. K. ZYBYLSKI

Mr. H. STEPOSZ

Romania:

Mr. N. ECOBESCO

Mr. O. IONESCO

Mr. V. TARZIORU

Sweden:

Mr. A. EDELSTAM

Mr. R. BOMAN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN

Mr. R.M. TIMERBAEV

Mr. V.V. SHUSTOV

Mr. M.P. SHELEPIN

United Arab Republic:

Mr. H. KHALLAF

Mr. O. SIRRY

Mr. A.R. ELREEDY

Mr. Y. RIZK

United Kingdom:

Mr. I.F. PORTER

Mr. W.N. HILLIER-FRY

Mr. R.I.T. CROMARTIE

United States of America:

Mr. G. BUNN

Mr. C. GLEYSTEEN

Mr. C.G. BREAM

Mr. W. GIVAN

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

1. The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): I declare open the 393rd plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.
2. Mr. BURNS (Canada): The Canadian delegation is taking the floor again today in order to discuss further the question of peaceful nuclear explosive services, upon which the delegations of the Soviet Union, the United States, Sweden, the United Kingdom, Mexico, India and Italy have all touched since we reconvened in the middle of last month. Since it is likely to be some months before there will be another opportunity for a statement to be made on this subject in this Committee, we should like to put our views on record.
3. Since the non-proliferation treaty (ENDC/226*) requires action to be taken for the provision of peaceful nuclear explosive services, the discussion by the delegations to which I have referred seems to be quite appropriate. We must bear in mind that, when the non-proliferation treaty comes into force, a great deal of work will still remain to be done. There will be agreements between signatory States and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to be negotiated and made operational in accordance with the provisions of article III. We expect that there will be a general desire that the enlarged co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy envisaged in article IV should be developed in an orderly manner, presumably through the IAEA. In accordance with the obligations assumed under article VI, negotiations regarding cessation of the nuclear arms race will go forward in this Committee and among the nuclear Powers. In connexion with article V consideration will have to be given to what is meant by "appropriate international observation" and "appropriate international procedures", which might be set out in "a special international agreement or agreements" concerning the provision of nuclear explosive services.
4. Article V of the non-proliferation treaty provides that "Negotiations on this subject shall commence as soon as possible after the Treaty enters into force". It appears to the Canadian delegation that the general exchange of views that we have had in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee has been useful, in advance of the actual negotiations that are to be carried out. We hope that the necessary ratifications will bring the non-proliferation treaty into force at an early date; and if that happens we may not have many other opportunities for such exchanges of views. As the Soviet representative said at the meeting on 1 August:

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

"... we shall have to elaborate in the very near future, in accordance with article V of the non-proliferation treaty, international procedures for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes". (ENDC/PV.386, para.67)

5. Although we think it appropriate that we have had exchanges on this subject in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, the Canadian delegation does not wish to prejudge the question of whether the detailed negotiations should be conducted here or elsewhere. The United States representative suggested that the negotiations should take place in the IAEA when he said at our meeting on 25 July that we should turn "to the IAEA as the appropriate forum in which specific procedures should be developed for providing such services ..." (ENDC/PV.384, para.5) We take it that the United States representative was referring not only to the agreements which would need to be worked out in each case for the provision of services, but also to a broad agreement which would make more specific the general obligations accepted under article V of the non-proliferation treaty and would establish the framework and standards according to which specific operational agreements would be negotiated.

6. Clearly the IAEA will be the proper place to work out detailed "contractual" agreements for specific projects. However, we consider that an over-all agreement enlarging on article V would be a desirable first move. We therefore welcomed the interpretation given by the representative of the United States to the final version of article V when he spoke in the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on 31 May. Mr. Goldberg said on that occasion:

"This language contemplates a basic agreement defining the functions of the appropriate international body and holds open the possibilities of a series of separate international agreements dealing with particular projects".

(A/C.1/PV.1577, provisional, p.78)

As the IAEA is the international body established to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, we think that it would also be the appropriate forum in which to negotiate the basic agreement regarding the provision of nuclear explosive services for peaceful uses.

7. However, we are prepared to leave open for the present the question of the negotiating forum. We do not think we should overlook the manner in which article V of the non-proliferation treaty assumed its present form, and the relationship of article V to the international agreement in question. That article was drafted here

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and not by the IAEA Board of Governors; and it was revised by the First Committee of the General Assembly and not by the General Conference of the IAEA. We consider that it would be appropriate, if the opportunity were offered, to continue to examine the question in the Eighteen-Nation Committee in a preliminary way, following which it might be referred to the IAEA for study, working discussions and eventually negotiations. In that connexion the Canadian delegation has taken note of the suggestions made by the representative of Mexico on 13 August (ENDC/PV.389, para.57) with respect to the possibility of establishing a sub-committee to deal with this question.

8. In a statement delivered on 12 September 1967 (ENDC/PV.329), the Canadian delegation reviewed positions with regard to peaceful nuclear explosions which had been expressed in preceding weeks by a number of delegations. The statement went on to describe in general terms what we considered at that time to be the basic elements of an international agreement concerning the provision to non-nuclear-weapon States by nuclear-weapon States of nuclear explosions for peaceful applications. Since that time there has been the further discussion in this Committee which led to the addition of article V to the draft non-proliferation treaty (ENDC/192, 193). There was also an extensive discussion in the resumed twenty-second session of the General Assembly, which in turn led to revisions of article V when the treaty was given its final form.

9. Since the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament reconvened, the United States representative has made a statement, on 25 July (ENDC/PV.384), devoted to peaceful nuclear explosions. The Canadian delegation considers that statement interesting and useful and agrees with the points made by the United States delegation. We think that some of those points might be elaborated and developed.

10. I would remind the Committee that at our meeting on 21 February (ENDC/PV.368) I discussed the cost in time, money and skilled manpower required for a non-nuclear-weapon State to produce its own nuclear explosive device for peaceful applications. I suggested that in the circumstances the non-nuclear-weapon States were getting a good bargain in article V of the non-proliferation treaty. That Canadian view of article V has been reinforced by what the United States representative had to say about the stage of development of peaceful nuclear explosive devices in the United States. We should emphasize the point that over the past twenty-five years the United States has exploded a large number of varied nuclear devices in its development programme. Mr. Foster said:

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

"... considerable effort is still required to transform our existing knowledge of nuclear device design into nuclear explosives which are useful in a variety of industrial applications". (ENDC/PV.384, para.9)

Mr. Foster had more to say about the problems remaining to be solved; and those who feel that article V does not provide satisfactory compensation for what the non-proliferation treaty requires them to give up, by extending the prohibitions in article II to "other nuclear explosive devices", will find much to think about in his statement to which I have referred.

11. In another passage of special interest to this Committee the United States representative referred to the problem of developing nuclear explosive devices for peaceful applications within the restrictions of the provisions of the limited test-ban Treaty (ENDC/100/Rev.1). After noting that the development of technology for the application of nuclear explosions to underground engineering projects would not cause problems, Mr. Foster said:

"The complete development of technology for some nuclear excavation projects cannot be carried out completely, however, within the present restrictions of the limited test-ban treaty. Modification of those restrictions would be required to permit the complete development of the technology and the execution of such projects." (ENDC/PV.384, para.16)

12. At our meeting on 30 July the representative of Sweden referred to the problem of development of nuclear explosive devices for peaceful purposes in the context of a comprehensive test ban (ENDC/PV.385, para.20). Mrs. Myrdal has thus drawn our attention to the need to resolve the conflict between the aim of ending qualitatively the nuclear armaments race by halting the testing of new designs of weapons and the aim of developing the efficiency of nuclear explosive devices for peaceful applications by testing new designs. That is obviously not going to be an easy problem to solve, since the nuclear-weapon Powers will have to agree on ways and means of reassuring not only each other but also the rest of the world that they are not pursuing weapons development under the guise of explosions for peaceful purposes. It is clear that some appropriate arrangements will have to be devised for control of both developmental test explosions and industrial application explosions carried out with their own resources and within their own territories by nuclear-weapon States.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

13. In the view of the Canadian delegation, that question might best be dealt with later in the comprehensive test-ban treaty. I note that the representative of Sweden, when outlining her views on the content of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, referred to "exceptions" for peaceful nuclear explosions (*ibid.*, para.26). The representative of India also referred to the relationship between arrangements for peaceful nuclear explosions and the comprehensive test ban in his statement on 13 August (ENDC/PV.389, para.15). The Canadian delegation is fully conscious of the need to ensure that any arrangements governing peaceful nuclear explosive services, which will represent an important step in following up the non-proliferation treaty, should be fully compatible with a comprehensive test ban.

14. I have already indicated that in the Canadian view the IAEA should have a central role in this matter. That would be in accordance with the authority of the IAEA under article III A 1 of its Statute to "act as an intermediary for the purposes of securing the performance of services ... by one member ... for another."

15. Some of the more important functions to be performed by the IAEA in connexion with peaceful nuclear explosive services would include the following: (a) to collect and publish scientific and technical information about peaceful applications of nuclear explosive technology; (b) when so requested, to act as an intermediary in arranging for peaceful nuclear explosions to be carried out by one country on the territory of another; (c) to register and to publish the intention of one country to carry out a nuclear explosion on the territory of another; and (d) to make provisions for the observation of peaceful nuclear explosions carried out in the territory of non-nuclear weapon States in order to prevent transmission of essential technology or the infringement of international treaty obligations, and to advise on appropriate measures to protect human health and property.

16. The Canadian delegation noted with interest the points made by the representative of Italy at our meeting on 22 August (ENDC/PV.392, paras.23 *et seq.*) with respect to certain of the functions I have just listed. We shall give further study in this context to the relevant passages in his statement.

17. The Canadian delegation considers that nuclear-weapon States in a position to provide nuclear explosive services should undertake to make such services available either through the IAEA or bilaterally at minimum cost on a non-discriminatory basis. They might also undertake to make available, without charge, information about peaceful applications of nuclear explosions -- but of course excluding technical data

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

about manufacture of nuclear explosive devices. It would be important to ensure that all explosive devices should remain under sole custody and secure control of the nuclear State providing the services. Countries providing or receiving nuclear explosive services, whether bilaterally or through the IAEA, would notify their intention to the IAEA, which would publish this information.

18. The possible role of the IAEA as the intermediary, when so requested, in negotiations between nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States and in observing explosions on territories of non-nuclear-weapon States are matters which, in the view of the Canadian delegation, require further consideration and study by experts and by the governments concerned.

19. Before concluding, I should like to turn to the suggestion made by the representative of the United Kingdom at our meeting on 16 July (ENDC/PV.381, para.31). At that meeting Mr. Mulley expressed the hope that during the present month it could be agreed that the co-Chairmen write to the Chairman of the IAEA Board of Governors asking him to arrange for the IAEA to study and in due course report on the part it might play in implementing article V. As a modification, the Canadian delegation would have preferred to include in our report a request to the United Nations General Assembly that it request the IAEA to study the question of peaceful nuclear explosions and the role the IAEA might play in regulating such services with particular reference to article V of the non-proliferation treaty. While it is rather late in our session to discuss the inclusion of such a passage in the report --- and the Canadian delegation is therefore not now making a proposal to that effect ---, we hope that members of this Committee will reflect on the merits of making a request of that kind to the United Nations General Assembly. This is a question to which we may wish to revert at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly.

20. Mr. KHALAF (United Arab Republic): On behalf of the delegations of Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden and the United Arab Republic, I have the privilege to present their joint memorandum on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. As this document (ENDC/235) has already been circulated to the members of the Committee, I shall refrain from reading it out.

21. The delegations of these eight countries formally request that this document be incorporated in the report on the work of our Committee during its present session. They trust that their joint views will receive careful study, in the same constructive and purposeful spirit in which they are submitting those views.

22. The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): The members of the Committee have heard the request of the eight delegations. In accordance with our precedents I think that effect should be given to that request. Since there is no objection, the joint memorandum will be included in the report.

23. Mr. HUSAIN (India): We are meeting here today, on 27 August. We are supposed to conclude our deliberations today or tomorrow, or at the latest on Thursday morning, because we shall all be engaged on Thursday afternoon in the proceedings of the opening meeting of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States. I am therefore wondering when we shall be discussing the draft of our report to the General Assembly.

24. On Friday last my delegation received informally a copy of a draft report. I was expecting that this document would be circulated to us formally this morning for discussion. But I do not see that this has been done. I do think that before we disperse this morning we ought to decide on the procedure for the discussion of the draft report. The Indian delegation has considered the informal document which it has received, and we have certain reservations with regard to it. Other delegations may have views of their own. I do think that this matter should not be postponed indefinitely, and that we should decide on our timetable for discussing it. Otherwise we shall find ourselves in the position that we shall have to go to another conference the day after tomorrow without having had time to discuss the draft report of this Committee, and this matter will be kept hanging in mid-air without a decision. Our work at the other conference will be dislocated, which will be very unfortunate. So I should like to request through you, Mr. Chairman, the views of the co-Chairmen on the timetable which they propose for discussing the draft report.

25. Mr. BUNN (United States of America): As the representative of India has indicated, the draft final report was circulated privately to all delegations on Friday last. The co-Chairmen have not submitted the draft officially because they thought that the report should be made available to the Press in final form only after it had been adopted by the Committee, and that therefore it would be premature to submit it officially now. But on behalf of the co-Chairmen I may say that we would welcome comments today on the draft report, if delegations are prepared to make them. We could then meet again and take those comments into account before officially submitting a draft report to the Committee for its consideration.

26. Mr. KHALLAFF (United Arab Republic): I should like to suggest that every delegation which has comments to make should communicate them to the co-Chairmen, who I am sure will give full consideration to them in preparing another draft or modifying the present one. We could then meet, for example on Thursday, to consider the new draft report or the amended version of the present draft.

27. The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): We have before us two proposals -- one by the representative of the United States, on behalf of the co-Chairmen, that the delegations make comments on the draft report now; and the other by the representative of the United Arab Republic that delegations communicate their comments to the co-Chairmen for their consideration. Does any member have any comment on these suggestions?

28. Mr. BURNS (Canada): I agree that we should try to conclude our examination of this draft report as soon as possible, as the representative of India has said. But it occurs to me that the procedure suggested by Mr. Khallaf of the United Arab Republic would not lead to an early and final decision. Suppose, for example, that some delegation -- let us say that of the United Arab Republic -- wished a certain paragraph to be deleted from the draft report, and another delegation -- let us say that of Canada -- wished it to remain in the draft report. Unless there is some discussion in the whole Committee, the unfortunate co-Chairmen will probably be presented with a series of individual views rather than with the views of the whole Committee. Those delegations in the Committee which are satisfied with what is now included in the draft report would not say anything about it; those delegations which are dissatisfied would say that this or that should be changed -- and then the delegations which were satisfied with the original draft might have objections to those changes. Therefore I should like to propose that, as we all have copies of the draft report dated 23 August, those delegations which have objections to raise or changes to propose should here and now do so, in order that we may all be able to express our opinions on any proposed changes.

29. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): We should merely like to point out that there is no contradiction between the proposal which has been made today on behalf of the co-Chairmen by the representative of the United States, and the proposal which has now been made by the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Khallaf. Here we can adopt a somewhat flexible procedure in

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

working on the final draft of the report. In fact, a number of delegations may wish to express their views at the present meeting. These views will of course be taken into account by the co-Chairmen in preparing the final text of the report. Some delegations wish to transmit their views individually to the co-Chairmen either in the form of short memoranda or by way of consultations with the co-Chairmen. It is quite natural that a number of delegations should wish to express their views here. Some delegations would like to continue their consultations with the co-Chairmen and express their views to the co-Chairmen directly.

30. It seems to me therefore that we should adopt the most flexible procedure for our common consultations on the final draft of the report; in other words, that we should give an opportunity to each delegation, or to those delegations who wish to do so, to speak at the present meeting and to state their views on the informal -- not final -- draft report which was circulated on Friday to delegations, while some other delegations will wish to do so by way of consultations, without resorting to statements at the present meeting.

31. For our part, we hope that an exchange of views here in the Committee at the present meeting, as well as the continuation of consultations proposed by the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Khalaf, will enable the co-Chairmen to prepare a final version of the report and to present it, if possible, at tomorrow's meeting of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

32. The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): I thank the representative of the Soviet Union, who has now proposed a compromise formula.

33. Mr. HUSAIN (India): Our basic problem is the shortage of time available to us. In my view the only feasible and helpful solution is that which has been suggested by the co-Chairman, the United States and the Soviet Union. I feel that it would be very useful for us to express our views here, as proposed by Mr. Burns, the representative of Canada, so that they could be taken into consideration and a revised version, if the co-Chairmen so agree, could be presented to us formally at a meeting tomorrow. It would be preferable if we could conclude our deliberations tomorrow, so that on Thursday we could get ready for the other Conference which is to follow.

34. There is just no time for individual communication of comments to the co-Chairmen, and that would also involve the co-ordination of such comments and their discussion in this Committee. We have, at the most, one or perhaps two meetings before us, and our work can be concluded only if we discuss this matter here and now.

35. The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): Since the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Khallaf, made a formal proposal, I should now like to ask him whether he agrees to the suggested procedure.

36. Mr. KHALLAF (United Arab Republic): My delegation has no objection to our discussing this matter here. However, the draft report was presented to us in an informal way, and that is why I feel that our discussion of it also should proceed in an informal way. This would appear to be logical. I wonder therefore if we might not now hold an informal meeting. This is perhaps not too important, but an informal meeting would seem to be more logical.

37. The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): The representative of the United Arab Republic has proposed that we proceed to hold an informal meeting. I would venture to express the view that those delegations would have some remarks to make may not be entirely satisfied with an informal meeting. However, I invite delegations to express their own views on that.

38. Mr. HUSAIN (India): I think that even technically it is really for the co-Chairmen to say whether this document is available for discussion in a formal meeting of the Committee. As the co-Chairmen have said that they are willing to have an expression of views in a formal meeting of the Committee, I do not think we should reject their suggestion by proceeding to discuss this draft report in an informal way only.

39. The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): I think the representative of India is correct in stating that the co-Chairmen have agreed to a discussion here of the draft presented by them. If Mr. Khallaf would agree, I would therefore invite delegations which have observations to make about the report to make them now.

40. Mr. KHALLAF (United Arab Republic): I have no objection.

41. The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): I therefore invite any delegations which have observations to make about the report to make them now.

42. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): My delegation has some brief remarks concerning the draft report.

43. As has rightly been underlined by practically all speakers at this session of our Committee, the conclusion of the non-proliferation treaty has aroused justified hopes

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

and has created a starting-point for further disarmament measures. The Polish delegation therefore welcomes the reference in the draft report to the importance of the non-proliferation treaty. It is indeed our hope that the treaty will have the widest possible adherence and that its provisions will be implemented as soon as possible.

44. We are gratified to note that every delegation in this Committee has demonstrated its readiness to contribute new ideas and make new efforts at this new stage of disarmament negotiations. The draft report now before us is a reflection and an outcome of those common efforts, a sort of fusion of opinions, suggestions and specific proposals that have been advanced in the course of the debates. The problem of different measures of nuclear disarmament has no doubt dominated our deliberations, and that is rightly reflected in the draft report.

45. In the opinion of the Polish delegation, the adoption of the agenda, as reproduced in the draft report, is a success of this session of the Committee. Although the agenda does not define a precise order of priorities, it provides important and definite guidelines for the future work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

46. I should like to stress the spirit of co-operation which has prevailed here during our work and recall some of the results obtained in the past when such a spirit was predominant. I have in mind in particular the preparation of the report of the Secretary-General on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons (A/6858) -- a report which the Polish delegation initiated, together with the delegation of Canada and other delegations, at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly. In that particular case a group of highly-qualified experts, representing major political and geographical areas in the world, was able to put forward a unanimous report without avoiding the controversial issues involved, thus giving an example of what can be achieved through international scientific co-operation. The practical usefulness of that report in the discussions of the non-proliferation treaty has been generally recognized.

47. Encouraged by that example, and after the question of bacteriological and chemical weapons was raised at this session of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, the Polish delegation in its statement of 30 July (ENDC/PV.385, para. 70) formulated the proposal that the Secretary-General should prepare a report on the effects of the possible use of bacteriological and chemical weapons.

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

48. I should like to express my thanks and appreciation to all delegations which have supported our proposal. I am very glad that, following the Polish proposal, the report contains a recommendation to the General Assembly:

"... that the Secretary-General appoint a group of experts to conduct a study on the effects of the possible use of chemical and bacteriological weapons."

49. I should like to mention that, while I endorse the views so brilliantly presented here by the representative of India, Mr. Husain, in his statement of 22 August (ENDC/PV.392), I am not convinced that it would be right for us now to advise the Secretary-General as to how many groups of experts he should appoint to help him to prepare this study; or that, instead of one study, there might need to be two studies dealing separately with chemical and bacteriological weapons. It may be worth while to recall here that, in the case of the report on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons, there was one study consisting of three parts, with some general conclusions relating to the whole problem.

50. The Polish delegation is confident that the Secretary-General will find an appropriate way to carry out the task that we propose to entrust to him and that he will prepare a report that -- to use the words of the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Myrdal, in her brilliant statement of 20 August (ENDC/PV.391, para. 19) -- would not damage or undermine the ban already expressed in the Geneva Protocol of 1925, but would strengthen it by giving it the broadest possible interpretation. May I add to this that I sincerely believe that the report we are requesting of the Secretary-General will become an appeal, based on scientific data, to those States which have not yet acceded to the Geneva Protocol of 17 June 1925 to do so without further delay.

51. In conclusion, the Polish delegation wishes to put on record its support and approval of the draft report now before us, which was circulated last Friday.

52. The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): I understand that the representative of Poland is not making any specific recommendation for a modification of the report.

53. Mr. CARACCIOLO (Italy): As the representative of India has said, our problem is one of time. The draft report has been in our hands only since Friday. That means that we have had only four or five days to contact our Governments and obtain their reactions.

54. For my part, speaking for the Italian delegation, I can say that I have just received my Government's approval of the report as it stands. My Government has found that the special merit of the draft report is that it does not raise any controversial issues. Therefore, if the draft report as it stands is accepted by the Committee, I am in a position to give it the support of my Government. Should major changes be suggested, we shall again be confronted with the problem of time. In that case I hope that we shall be able to make the changes within the short time available to us.

55. Mr. HUSAIN (India): I should like first to recall the procedure we followed at our last session for the adoption of the report to the General Assembly. It will be recalled that, as on this occasion, the co-Chairmen circulated informally a draft of the report. That was discussed with individual delegations, some negotiations took place and agreement was reached, and the report was adopted by the Committee without any discussion. It was a very difficult and delicate report, but the work on it was concluded speedily and successfully.

56. This time, because of the shortage of time available to us for the adoption of the report, it has not been found possible to have an informal exchange of views with the co-Chairmen; hence the need to discuss the matter here. We would have preferred informal discussions, because that is a speedier means of arriving at an agreement.

57. The first thing that my delegation notes about the draft before us is that there is a significant change in the format of the report: that is, the mode of reporting to the General Assembly has been changed. It is rather unusual. Over the last six years it has been a well-established convention of this Committee to avoid lengthy procedural discussions. The communiqués of our meetings and our reports to the General Assembly have been of a purely factual nature. There has hardly ever been any reference to the substance of the statements; there has never been any attempt to summarize statements or even to list proposals made by individual delegations; there has never been any discussion of substantive questions in the reports. This convention, if I may say so, was found to be necessary because of the difficulties in finding agreed formulations on such matters. So far as the views of individual delegations were concerned, they were all evident from the massive documentation which was forwarded with our reports.

58. Now, in the report before us, there is a departure from our traditional practice. Some delegations view that as a good thing; some, as not such a good thing. My delegation is in the second category. However, regardless of that departure -- and we can of course have a departure should it be considered in the interest of our work -- the fact remains that the format now proposed does create some difficulties and we would need to arrive at a consensus after some discussion and, I believe, some necessary modifications in the draft. So the problem before us has been created as a result of the change in the format.

59. It has been said informally that the change in the format of the report and the mode of presentation to the General Assembly has been made with a view to presenting to the General Assembly, and to the world at large, a better and a more impressive image of the work of the Committee -- a kind of public relations job. It will be recalled that when we had an informal meeting not long ago the question of the public relations job was mentioned. It is intended to remove the impression that we are not doing very much. The idea is to impress others that we are doing important work, and a great deal of it. This wish to present a better and prettier picture of ourselves is understandable and I would go along with it -- but this public relations attempt should take into consideration two important aspects.

60. The first is that we should not, in our attempt to be thought well of, create a credibility gap. We should not claim more than what we have done or intended to do. Our professions can easily be checked by anybody who looks at the records of the Committee. They are available to the public and to anyone who wishes to study them. We should be judged by our actions, by the concrete measures we agree upon here and present to the General Assembly and to the world at large. Our image would not be improved by making exaggerated claims or laudatory and self-congratulatory statements in a report to the General Assembly.

61. The second aspect is that it is very well for individuals to indulge in self-adulation or self-praise, or to present a rosy picture; but we are here as representatives of responsible Governments and we cannot indulge in that kind of a posture. The record of the Committee speaks for itself, and I do think that the record shows the usefulness, the value and the importance of our work and of this Committee without introducing an element of exaggeration.

62. I have made a somewhat general statement, and now I should like to illustrate what I mean. For example, on page 2 of the draft report, after a reference to the five General Assembly resolutions, it is stated that "The Committee gave serious attention to these resolutions". I should like to ask my colleagues: Did we really do that?

Did we discuss substantively any one of those five resolutions? Is it not an exaggeration to say that we "gave serious attention to these resolutions"?

63. May I point out just one other sentence? I could point out many, but I do not want to take up too much of the Committee's time. There is a statement on page 9 that "the Committee resumed consideration of the question of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control". Again I should like to ask my colleagues: Did we really do that? Have the Soviet Union and the United States presented anything to us since 1964 for the resumption of the discussions on general and complete disarmament? How many of us have spoken about it? How many of us have even discussed what progress we have made on general and complete disarmament, in order to be able to say that we have resumed consideration of that item? I need hardly add that, of the four headings under the section "Questions considered by the Committee", the one on general and complete disarmament is the last, in the fourth place.

64. All that could be justifiably and honestly said is that a few members of the Committee emphasized the need for the Committee to resume consideration of the item on general and complete disarmament. I do not think we can go beyond that factual statement.

65. I believe that when we discuss this report and the departure from our established practice, we should assess what we really have been doing for the last five weeks. Our record will show to anybody that this session has in fact been only a procedural session. It has been a session in which we have been planning our work for the future. And let me be frank: the Committee started its deliberations on 16 July, the agenda was adopted on 15 August, and now, twelve days later, we are concluding the session. The fact is that no substantive discussion has taken place on any item.

66. It is customary for committees to begin their work by adopting an agenda. But we have ended our deliberations with the adoption of an agenda; we have adopted it not at the beginning but at the end. Throughout a large part of the session we have been busy suggesting items for the agenda or what priorities might be accorded to them. Such brief expressions of views on items as have taken place during the session have been in regard to assessing priorities for those items. Some working

papers were submitted, of course, but no substantive discussion took place on any of them and no conclusions were reached, not even by way of disagreement. Indeed, no negotiations took place. Therefore the establishment of the agenda and the question of priorities with regard to the items on that agenda is the sum total of what we have discussed.

67. Hence, what is our total achievement? In my view we have achieved only two things. First, we have listed a number of items under four headings and assigned priority to the first heading. Second, we have recommended to the General Assembly that the Secretary-General be requested to prepare a report on chemical and bacteriological weapons. That is the sum total of our achievement --- and the first one is really a qualified achievement, because we could not agree upon inter se priorities under each heading; and even the narration of items under each heading is not complete, because the word "etc." is used.

68. I am not belittling the achievements of our six weeks of work. That is a short time, and it is quite clear that we could not have done more than establish an agenda of the kind that we have established. The establishment of an agenda for this Committee, as Mr. Roshchin very rightly and appropriately pointed out to us the other day, is not a mere matter of procedure: it is a matter with political implications. It is these political implications which prevented us from allocating priorities inter se, and that matter had to be postponed.

69. On the whole, I would say that we have no reason to be dissatisfied with our achievement. All that I wish to point out to my colleagues is that we must maintain a sense of balance and propriety in our report to the General Assembly. Let us not be shy about admitting that we could not do more. I do not think that any other committee could have done better. What we have done is clear from the record, and we should not pretend that we have done more.

70. Having said that, I should now like to make some specific comments on various paragraphs of the draft before us. On account of the shortage of time I do not wish to go into some of the exaggerations I have pointed out, but should like to confine my suggestions to the minimum number of points for consideration by the co-Chairmen.

71. The first comment relates to the paragraph at the middle of page 2. I would like to comment in detail on this paragraph, because I consider it to be very important and my delegation has very serious reservations about it.

(Mr. Husain, India)

72. The first sentence of the paragraph in question welcomes the statement in General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII) (ENDC/226) expressing appreciation of the work of this Committee. It is not clear to me why it is necessary to mention that in a report which concerns the adoption of an agenda. This appreciative reference in the resolution of the General Assembly is a routine reference to be found, I believe, in all resolutions adopted anywhere which refer to the work of a committee. This is not an unusual or exceptional reference. All seventeen of us sitting here were also present in New York, and we expressed our views on this resolution. Therefore I do not see why we need to come back from New York, having adopted a resolution there, and state in a report: "This is what that resolution said." It is redundant.

73. The second and third sentences of the same paragraph of the draft report are also a little unusual. The second sentence refers to the importance of the non-proliferation treaty and expresses the hope for as wide an adherence as possible. The third sentence stresses the importance of implementing the non-proliferation treaty. I do not see the need for those two sentences, and I shall give my reasons.

74. We concluded our work on the non-proliferation treaty at the last session and, as a result of the report submitted by the Committee (ENDC/225), the General Assembly adopted a resolution, after which the treaty was opened for signature; it has now been subscribed to by more than seventy countries. I repeat: the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament concluded the work on this matter at its last session. Why do we bring it into the draft report under discussion, a report which relates to future work, not to past work? The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has not been given the task of seeing to the implementation of the non-proliferation treaty. We are engaged in discussing and negotiating other measures of disarmament now.

75. Furthermore, I do not see that it is our function to conduct a post-mortem examination of a treaty already concluded, whether the non-proliferation treaty, the partial test-ban Treaty, or the Treaty on outer space. If it were the function of this Committee to engage in that kind of examination, I would say that in regard to the non-proliferation treaty we should start discussing the effect of the non-adherence of China and France to that treaty; we should discuss the non-adherence of certain important threshold Powers; we should discuss the effect of the developments in Czechoslovakia on the non-proliferation treaty, the statements made by Chancellor Kiesinger, the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Italy which was read out the other day (ENDC/PV.392, para. 75) by my Italian colleague, and the Press comments in

(Mr. Husain, India)

the United States questioning the desirability of that country ratifying the treaty. Then we should go on to discuss the partial test-ban Treaty, the effect of the French thermonuclear test which took place two days ago, and so forth.

76. But that is not the function of this Committee. In relation to the non-proliferation treaty we are concerned only with operative paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII), adopted at the resumed twenty-second session. That paragraph relates, not to the non-proliferation treaty, but to the pursuance of negotiations on nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament. Many references have been made to resolution 2373 (XXII), but I do not see that they add anything to the reference in the earlier paragraph of the draft report to General Assembly resolution 2342 A (XXII) (ENDC/210).

77. For those reasons I feel that the paragraph in question should be deleted. My delegation cannot go along with it.

78. I come now to page 4, paragraph 4. There the draft report reproduces the agenda; but before doing so it gives the desiderata which were considered by this Committee, or by the co-Chairmen --- that point is not quite clear ---, before the agenda was adopted. It would be my concrete proposal --- and it could be put formally --- that the phrase beginning with the words "in response to ..." and ending with the words "members of the Committee" ought to be deleted, and that the sentence should read:

"After considerable discussion and in recognition of the views expressed by the members of the Committee, on 15 August the co-Chairmen proposed and the Committee adopted the following provisional agenda ..."

79. My reasons for proposing that wording are as follows. First, the statement would be factual. It is a fact that the agenda was proposed by the co-Chairmen on 15 August and was adopted on that date. It is a fact that it was proposed by the co-Chairmen and not by the other members of this Committee. The second reason concerns the desiderata. Are we going to enumerate all the desiderata? Why pick on two or three particular items? The desiderata which were before the Committee and the co-Chairmen were massive. They consisted of five General Assembly resolutions, the Soviet memorandum, the statement of President Johnson, the proposals made by the United Kingdom and the Swedish delegations, a number of working papers submitted to the Committee, and a number of proposals made in statements to the Committee. A large bundle of matters was placed before the Committee. Therefore I do not see why we should pick out two or three particular items and mention those alone as desiderata, ignoring the others.

(Mr. Husain, India)

80. In fact, none of the desiderata needs to be mentioned here, because they are all reproduced accurately and in full in the preceding section. At the top of page 3 one sees "Messages, Working Papers and Other Documents submitted to the Conference", and then there is a list of the whole lot. It was in the light of all that material that the co-Chairmen, after having heard expressions of view by members of the Committee, proposed an agenda, which was unanimously adopted. Therefore it would be invidious, and in my view objectionable, to pick out two items: the treaty on non-proliferation, and the bilateral discussions on the limitation and reduction of offensive and strategic weapons.

81. In this connexion I do not see the relevance of the reference to the non-proliferation treaty. As I said earlier, we are now concerned with operative paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII) and not with the non-proliferation treaty. In view of those considerations, I suggest the deletion which I have mentioned.

82. I should now like to turn next to page 7, paragraph 3. It will be recalled that throughout our discussion about the priorities to be assigned to various items before the adoption of the agenda and after its adoption, it was clearly stated by many delegations -- and I believe even conceded by the co-Chairmen in their statements -- that at some stage or other it would be necessary to determine the inter se priority of the various items listed in the agenda. As I said earlier, we did come to an agreement that heading 1 should be regarded as having priority over the others; but inter se priority within each heading was not determined, although it was considered desirable that such priority should be determined. Therefore I propose that on page 7 at the end of paragraph 3 the following words should be added: "The Committee believes that an early determination of inter se priority among those measures would greatly facilitate its task."

83. Before I conclude, I should like to make one brief comment in regard to the only substantive recommendation which we are making to the General Assembly, and that is the request to the Secretary-General to report on chemical and bacteriological weapons. I said in my statement on 22 August (ENDC/PV.392, para. 6) that we should carefully consider the terms of reference on this item, since it is the only substantive agreement we have to show for our six weeks' work. To my mind the wording in the draft report is not quite satisfactory. I am not proposing incorporation of the views expressed by me on this subject, but I do feel that the sentence could be better worded.

(Mr. Husain, India)

I believe that in the last sentence on page 7, which continues on to page 8, the words "to conduct a study" should be deleted, and that the sentence should read as follows:

"The Committee agreed to recommend to the General Assembly that the Secretary-General appoint a group of experts to study the nature and effects of the possible use of chemical and bacteriological weapons ..."

Members will notice that I propose the use of the term "nature and effects".

Unless we study the nature of these weapons we cannot study their effects. It is therefore necessary to use the term I have proposed.

84. A further point is that there is no indication as to when the report on this study is to be submitted: in one week, in one month, in six months, in one year, in ten years, or in fifty years. I feel that the above-mentioned sentence should end with the words "and to submit a report at an early date".

85. It is not clear to me why the next sentence in this paragraph has been included. I refer to the sentence which reads:

"Because of the importance of this matter the Committee expresses the hope that the report on this study will be referred to the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Committee."

I have pondered long over the meaning of that sentence, and it is still unclear. We want this report, but why do we bring in the Security Council? Is it the function of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to direct the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council? There may be constitutional objections to such a formulation. It is not provided anywhere that this Committee can direct the Secretary-General to submit a report to this or that organ of the United Nations. We are making a proposal for the consideration of the General Assembly. It is by a resolution of the General Assembly that the Secretary-General will be directed to prepare a report, as was done in regard to the report on the effects of nuclear weapons. Therefore I think that the sentence in question is inappropriate and unnecessary and should be deleted.

86. To sum up, I have made the following specific proposals for the consideration of the co-Chairmen: On page 2, the deletion of paragraph 2. On page 4, the deletion of a certain part of paragraph 4 and the addition of the words "on 15 August the co-Chairmen proposed and". On page 7, the addition of a sentence to paragraph 3. At the end of page 7 and the beginning of page 8, the deletion of some words and the addition of others, and the deletion of one sentence.

87. Mr. EDELSTAM (Sweden): I do not view the draft report we have before us in the same light as the representative of India; but I shall not enter into any polemics with him. However, I think it must be said that our delegation belongs to the first category of the two categories he mentioned: that is, the delegations which like the idea of a fuller and more substantial report by the Committee than we have had in the past. Therefore we greet with pleasure the new suggestions from the co-Chairmen.

88. We are ready to go along with the draft report as suggested; but I should like to read out some of the suggestions we have to make. We are prepared also to submit them to the co-Chairmen in writing. We would be happy if they could be included in the report; but we shall not raise any strong objections if they are not.

89. The first suggestion concerns the last paragraph of page 6, which deals with the test-ban question. We would think it reasonable if there could be a reference in this connexion to the work on the scientific level which has been done unofficially in Sweden this year. We would hope that the co-Chairmen in the first place and the Committee in the second place could agree to the addition of a paragraph at the bottom of page 6 which would read as follows:

"Members of the Committee expressed their satisfaction at the fact that scientific experts representing, inter alia, four nuclear-weapon States had met recently unofficially to discuss seismic methods for monitoring an underground test ban, and expressed the view that such discussions should continue."

This is a statement of fact -- there are several such statements in the report --, and we think it will add something of value to the report for consideration by members of the General Assembly.

90. My second point concerns the suggested study by experts of chemical and biological weapons. This is perhaps not very important; but I thought it might be useful to elaborate a little on the proposal by the United Kingdom delegation and, unless the United Kingdom representative has any strong objections, we should like to suggest that the second sentence in the last paragraph on page 7 should read something like the following, which would be in line with what was actually said by the United Kingdom representative in the Committee (ENDC/PV.387, para.10):

"The United Kingdom proposed a study by the Secretary-General on the nature and possible effects of chemical weapons and on the implications of their use."

That would state a little more fully what I think the United Kingdom representative had in mind.

(Mr. Edelstam, Sweden)

91. In accordance with our views I would suggest also -- as has been suggested by the representative of India -- the addition of a few words on the mandate to be given to the proposed study; this relates to the last sentence on page 7, which continues on to page 8. I fully understand the reason why the word "bacteriological" has been used throughout this report: it is the word which is used in the Geneva Protocol. But we consider -- and we developed this point in our intervention on the matter in the Committee (ENDC/PV.391, paras, 7, 17) -- that the word "biological" is more suitable because it is a wider word which covers more fully the various agents that can be used in warfare nowadays. Therefore we would prefer the use of the word "biological" here instead of "bacteriological".

92. We feel also that the word "weapons" is not as wide as the words we would suggest: "means of warfare". The word "weapons" suggests only the agent itself, whereas if we use the words "means of warfare" we ensure that the study would include the ways in which those weapons are introduced and disseminated. Those words have a wider meaning than the word "weapons".

93. Therefore our second suggestion on this paragraph concerning the study would be that the words at the top of page 8 starting with "effects of the possible use of bacteriological weapons" should be deleted and that we should say instead, as the representative of India suggested: "nature and effects of chemical and biological means of warfare."

94. Those were the three concrete suggestions that I wished to make.

95. U CHIT MYAING (Burma): In my intervention on 20 August (ENDC/PV.391, paras. 63 et seq.) I stated my delegation's views concerning the positive and useful groundwork done by our Committee during the current session. My delegation stands by those views. Nevertheless, we cannot help but feel that the draft report presented by the co-Chairmen claims a little too much as regards what the Committee has materially done or accomplished in the past six weeks. We very much hope that the co-Chairmen will find it possible to rectify this appropriately.

96. Regarding the contents of the draft report, my delegation will confine its observations to one specific point to which we attach overriding importance. Paragraph 2 on page 2 raises certain serious difficulties for my delegation. We find that this paragraph, from the second sentence onwards, attributes certain views regarding the non-proliferation treaty to "members of the Committee", which can only mean all the members of the Committee. We do not think that that assertion is supported by

(U Chit Myaing, Burma)

the Committee's proceedings. My delegation, for one, cannot remember having expressed such views. We would therefore request the co-Chairmen to make such modifications as would make the paragraph reflect accurately the true position.

97. The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): I should like to speak in my capacity as representative of Brazil. My intervention will be brief, for I have no original comments to make to the Committee and my delegation's view coincides in a large measure with what has been said by the representatives of India and Burma. As the members of the Committee will see, my delegation belongs to the second category mentioned by the representative of India.

98. The Brazilian delegation doubts that this is the proper time to depart from the traditional pattern of our reports. As a matter of fact, it is possible to detect in the text we are considering certain variances between the records of the Committee and the emphasis given to some issues in the draft report. What we have really been discussing in this session is a programme of work. The achievements of the Committee have therefore been limited. In short, my delegation would prefer a more modest report.

99. With regard to the reference made to the non-proliferation treaty in the second paragraph on page 2: although we do not deny that many delegations have referred to that treaty along the lines mentioned in the report, we believe that there is an undue magnification of the importance of the role played by the non-proliferation treaty in our discussions during the present session. In a certain sense the report includes more on that point than it could legitimately be expected to include. In particular, the text contains only reaffirmations of statements and positions that have been made in due course in the appropriate instances.

100. I wonder also why the report should lay emphasis on the fact that the General Assembly has appreciated our past work.

101. My second point relates to the fourth paragraph on page 4, the question of the agenda. I think it may lead to a misinterpretation of the facts, in so far as it implies that, besides approving the agenda itself, the Committee approved some considerata. The co-Chairmen presented them, and were of course perfectly entitled to do so; but the Committee approved, on the proposition of the co-Chairmen, the agenda without any introduction. That should be precisely reflected in our report.

102. My delegation fully supports the remarks made by the representative of India.

103. Mr. KHALAF (United Arab Republic): I have not yet received any instructions from my Government about the report, but I can say that it is acceptable to my delegation. That does not prevent us from admitting the veracity of some of the remarks made here by some representatives who have spoken earlier. However, all in all, the report is acceptable to us. We think that if there has been a change in the form of the drafting it should not frighten us, for it does not depart from the traditional line of relating the facts. The facts may be related at some length or briefly. Here they are related at some length -- but they are still facts. This report is factual and so is in line with the tradition of the Committee.

104. I am sorry I cannot share the view of some of my colleagues who have said that we were busy working on the agenda during the whole of the current session. We did work on the agenda, and it is an important piece of work; but we worked, and very seriously, on some other points -- substantive points and not procedural points. When we spoke of the test ban, when we spoke of chemical weapons, when we spoke of peaceful uses of the sea-bed, and so on, those were all substantive matters and not agenda items. We worked on all of them and we had some lively discussions on every one of them.

105. I might say that really, to my mind, this session has been one of the most fruitful sessions of the Committee that I have attended, since the very beginning of 1966. It has been very short, but it has been very fruitful, not only on the procedural points, not only in the preparation of our future work, but on the substantive matters as well. That is one point.

106. My other point is that I cannot share the views of some of my colleagues on the reference to the non-proliferation treaty on pages 2 and 3. The treaty is mentioned in those two pages only for the purpose of relating the facts. For instance, it is a fact that we welcomed the statement in the General Assembly resolution. It is a fact that members of the Committee noted the importance of the non-proliferation treaty and hoped it would have the widest possible adherence in accordance with the wishes of the General Assembly. Those are facts; and if the report relates facts it is factual. And it is not a question of being factual on some minor points. For the non-proliferation treaty is not a minor point. It is the point at which we arrived after three years; it is the achievement of this Committee after very serious and very lengthy work; it is the legitimate child of this Committee. We cannot ignore that child. We cannot say that now we have the child and we can abandon it.

(Mr. Khallaf, United Arab Republic)

107. After all, we are not, if members will excuse the term, a factory or a laboratory for producing treaties on disarmament. We are a committee on disarmament. We have to discuss all matters of disarmament, whether there are treaties relating to them or not. In the Committee we have discussed and continue to discuss the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963. We are trying to complete that Treaty, and so on. We are not neglecting that Treaty simply because it has been concluded. The Treaty was concluded in 1963, but we continue to pay attention to it.

108. By the same logic we shall have to continue to pay attention to the non-proliferation treaty. That treaty has been concluded, but we must see whether it is implemented, and how. In particular there are some provisions in the treaty itself which call, not for some intervention on our part, but for some attention on our part, and continuing attention too. If we do that, we are acting within our jurisdiction and doing our duty. That is why mentioning the non-proliferation treaty in the report is very natural. I cannot really conceive of this report without this reference to the non-proliferation treaty.

109. Those were the few points that my delegation wished to raise now. There are some other points which I have already raised with the co-Chairmen and in our informal talks.

110. Mr. BURNS (Canada): The delegation of Canada, like the delegation of Italy, would be prepared to accept the report as drafted. We have listened with care to the proposals of the representatives of India, Sweden, Burma and the United Arab Republic regarding some changes which are thought to be desirable. With regard to the statement by the representative of the United Arab Republic, I must say that we agree with his contention that it is important, and indeed natural, that mention should be made in our report of the non-proliferation treaty. This arises out of resolution 2373 (XXII) (ENDC/226*), which called upon this Committee to do certain things resulting from the endorsement of the non-proliferation treaty by the General Assembly.

111. I do not wish to go too deeply into generalities, and shall therefore try to make some suggestions in regard to the amendments which have been proposed. The main change suggested is to the paragraph at the middle of page 2. We would go so far as to agree with the representative of India that it is not really necessary for us to thank the General Assembly for thanking us for what we have done in connexion with the non-proliferation treaty. We think the co-Chairmen might consider that particular sentence

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

to be superfluous. But I think that obviously, having listed all the different resolutions put before us, the report should go on to refer to resolution 2373 (XXII) and the work of the Committee relating to that resolution and to the non-proliferation treaty itself, which stemmed from that resolution; the work that we did in discussing various matters such as the comprehensive test ban, the arrangements for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, and so forth.

112. While, therefore, we would agree with the representative of the United Arab Republic that the last two sentences do state facts -- that members of the Committee noted the importance of the non-proliferation treaty, and expressed the view that the provisions of the treaty should be implemented --, we would hope that the co-Chairmen will study the suggestion to condense the second and third paragraphs on page 2 into factual statements reflecting the importance which the Committee attached to its work that would have to follow the non-proliferation treaty.

113. Incidentally, referring to what the representative of Burma said, the phrase "Members of the Committee" does not mean "All members of the Committee". If it were all members of the Committee, the wording would simply be "The Committee noted", etc. Therefore, in my view the phrase "Members of the Committee noted" means that some members noted, and is therefore a factual statement.

114. Turning to the proposed change in paragraph 4 on page 4, the Canadian delegation feels that the points mentioned were taken into consideration; that all of them were important points. They are not all the matters that were taken into consideration, but they are the most important ones. We therefore do not see that it is necessary to change this paragraph, or to say that this agenda was presented by the co-Chairmen, because that is our common and well-understood practice here. The Committee has adopted the agenda, and we do not have to say that the Committee adopted it on the motion of the co-Chairmen.

115. Finally, with regard to the proposals made by the representative of Sweden, we would naturally like to have them in writing so that we could consider them more carefully, but at first sight we feel that they could be adopted by the co-Chairmen and would perhaps improve the text as a whole.

116. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): The co-Chairmen will of course take into account all the comments which have been made by members of the Committee and, in accordance with the views and considerations expressed, will present a draft report so that the Committee can examine and approve it.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

In my capacity as representative of the Soviet Union, I should like to make a few preliminary comments on the discussion which has taken place about the draft report. 117. Actually, two basic positions have been stated in regard to the form of the report. On the one hand, the representative of India defended the proposition, which was supported by the representative of Brazil, that the report should be of a formal nature: that is, it should specify the number of meetings and the documents introduced and be accompanied by the verbatim records of the meetings. On the other hand, an attempt has been made to assess the work of the Committee. In the form in which the report has now been presented for consideration by the Committee, it gives more food for thought to the representatives at the session of the General Assembly than in the form in which it has been presented hitherto. An attempt has been made to go further forward so as to deal more accurately and extensively in the report with the work accomplished by the Committee.

118. In this connexion we should like to say that we are unable to share the opinion expressed by the representative of India that the session considered on the whole only questions of procedure. We fully agree with the opinion expressed by the representative of the United Arab Republic that the session, in spite of its brevity -- it lasted only six weeks -- has very effectively considered a whole range of questions dealing with the essence of disarmament and the cessation of the arms race. Consideration has been given to such questions as the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the prohibition of underground tests, the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons, and the non-utilization of the sea-bed for military purposes. It is quite another matter that we have been unable to work out any final decisions. But nobody even expected that it would be possible in such a brief session to come to any final decisions on the questions under consideration. But in any event the debates which have taken place and the discussion which has been carried on here have been a very substantial contribution to the consideration of the questions which have been entrusted to the Committee.

119. It has been stated here by the representative of India that the draft report does not reflect the actual state of affairs. In one example given by the representative of India, he challenged the statement that "the Committee gave serious consideration to the resolutions of the General Assembly". In fact the Committee did give serious consideration to the resolutions of the General Assembly. That, of course, does not mean that it has finally concluded consideration of the questions which were addressed to the Committee. But all the resolutions addressed to the Committee have been given

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

very thorough consideration, and the contributions made by the representatives who have spoken during the consideration of these questions have certainly been very useful. Can one say that the Committee did not give serious attention to the resolutions referred to it? It seems to me that such an assertion does not correspond with the actual state of affairs.

120. Then the question was raised of how we ought to react to the attitude of the General Assembly to the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee. The General Assembly, in resolution 2373 (XXII) (ENDC/226*), highly appreciated the work of the Committee on the elaboration of the draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The representative of India attempted to deprecate the importance of that resolution of the General Assembly. We know that the General Assembly highly appreciated the work of the Committee on the elaboration of the draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The majority of the delegations at the General Assembly stressed this point, and even a number of delegations who were not disposed to sign the non-proliferation treaty immediately or very soon nevertheless expressed very high appreciation of the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee in elaborating the draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Certainly the denial of this, in our opinion, lacks sufficient grounds. We consider that the Committee is entitled to note this situation, rendering what is due and treating with respect the General Assembly's opinion of its work.

121. With regard to the question of the importance of the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and whether we should note this in our draft report, it now seems to me that the representative of the United Arab Republic has very convincingly expressed his opinion on this subject and there is nothing left for me to add except to support that opinion and fully endorse it. The Committee has indeed accomplished a very great work, and, although the treaty is now at the stage of signing and ratification by governments, nevertheless members of the Committee can express their views concerning the non-proliferation treaty -- as in fact they have done.

122. I repeat once again that the views which have been expressed here will, of course, be taken into account by the co-Chairmen; but we should not deprecate the importance of the nature of our work as a whole, nor should we refrain from reproducing in the report those favourable references and assessments of the situation which have been expressed by the majority, not to say the overwhelming majority, of the members of the Committee.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

123. Mr. MALIKI (Nigeria): My delegation is in general agreement with the draft report but has minor suggestions both on its general form and on a few specific points in it.

124. On the general level we are of the opinion that the report in its present form will convey the impression that we are covering up for lack of real and substantive progress during this session. It is unnecessary to give examples, since this has already been done by Mr. Husain.

125. As regards specific points, we should like to suggest that more emphasis be given to the sentiments expressed by many delegations on an agreement on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. This has now become even more significant in view of the memorandum (ENDC/235) which has been submitted this morning.

126. My second point relates to the importance attached to the agenda which we were able to adopt at this session. While we agree that the adoption of a programme of work is a step in the right direction, we believe that some delegations would prefer to see a more limited section on the agenda.

127. Finally, we consider that the issue of regional arms has not been given the prominence during our discussions here to justify the prominence given to it in the report.

128. Mr. HUSAIN (India): Some very important comments have been made on the observations I made earlier. We shall carefully consider them and express our views on them.

129. The reason I have asked to speak again is to comment on what was said by the representatives of Burma and Canada in relation to the words "members of the Committee". I am not at the moment referring to any particular part of the draft report but to this general question as such. My understanding -- and I stand to be corrected -- is that in the past "members of the Committee" has always been taken to mean the whole Committee -- that is to say, the rule of unanimity. In this Committee we have followed the practice of unanimity. It will be recalled that this matter came up very prominently when at our last session we were drafting the report with regard to the non-proliferation treaty, and it was after considerable negotiation that we achieved an agreed report, in which no dissent was indicated. I feel therefore that this is a material point in regard to our procedure.

(Mr. Husain, India)

130. My understanding is that "members of the Committee" means all members. One can say "some members", "most members", or "members generally", but some definition has to be given. If, for example, the words "members of the Committee" are used and some delegations take a different view on a particular matter and do not wish to be classed or categorized with the majority of the members, then some reservation needs to be indicated. Therefore, when the co-Chairmen present to us the revised version of the draft in the light of the comments made today, this matter will have to be gone into and an understanding reached among all members of the Committee.

131. Mr. BUNN (United States of America): We shall, of course, take into consideration all of the views expressed today, and I think we can produce a report which the Committee can adopt.

132. On the question of unanimity, I should like to say that my delegation's understanding has always been that the Committee followed the practice of unanimity when it was a question of agreeing to some proposal. The statements in paragraph 2 of the draft report that have been referred to are not statements about agreeing to a particular proposal or reaching agreement on a particular measure. They are simply statements of fact. They are intended to be nothing more. They are supposed to reflect the fact that members of the Committee did in fact make certain statements. In that respect I agree with Mr. Burns that the use of the phrase in question does not mean that all members of the Committee made such statements. I do not think the rule of unanimity is really applicable in this case. In any event, this is simply a statement of fact.

133. Secondly, I should like to say to the representative of India that I think the report should be substantive. It is useful for us to say in the report as much as we can, giving hope for the future. I do not like the idea of a report that is simply a list of documents and of the number of meetings.

134. I might call attention to the fact that the memorandum which the eight nations have submitted to us today (ENDC/235) seems to go a good deal further than that. It is much more than simply a list of the number of meetings that the eight nations had together, or a list of the documents that were discussed in those meetings. It expresses strong views and strongly urges various points. It comes out with a number of conclusions and suggestions. I would say it is quite substantive. I myself do not see why it is not perfectly appropriate for the Committee to attempt to do the same

(Mr. Bunn, United States)

thing. Of course, we have to seek agreement here and see if we cannot get the report accepted by the Committee; but I do not accept the notion that the report should be dry and contain only a list of the meetings that have been held and the documents that have been submitted to the Committee.

135. I gather that the main complaint relates to the second paragraph on page 2 and to the question of referring to the non-proliferation treaty. I take it that it was the position of the representative of India that this Committee had no business considering points that had already been adopted by it or treaties that had already been achieved. I look again at the memorandum of the eight nations and I see that it says that "The eight delegations are gravely concerned by the fact that all countries have not yet adhered to the Partial Test Ban Treaty." (ibid., page 2) I see there is some suggestion that there have been "leakages of radioactivity outside the territorial limits . . . , thus causing infringements of the Partial Test Ban Treaty." (ibid.) I see a reference to the non-proliferation treaty. Well, if it is appropriate for the eight nations in their memorandum to refer to documents that have been presented and to agreements or treaties that have already been achieved, why is it not appropriate to do so in the report of the Committee? I, for one, think it is useful. The non-proliferation treaty was an achievement of this Committee, and a very important one, and there is no reason why we should not refer to it in our report.

136. Again, let me say that we shall take into consideration all the views that have been expressed here and shall, if at all possible, present a draft to the Committee tomorrow.

137. Mr. HUSAIN (India): I want to make just one brief comment on the remarks just made by the representative of the United States. I do not think we should confuse the views expressed by individual delegations, or a group of delegations, with a report to the General Assembly. The memorandum of the eight non-aligned countries (ENDC/235) contains the views expressed collectively of individual delegations which would be appended to the report, along with other such documents. There are statements made by all of us which would also be appended as the statements of individual delegations. The memorandum contains the views of a group of eight nations. This has nothing to do with a report of the Committee as a whole to the General Assembly.

138. When we are considering a report which is supposed to be unanimous, then we have to take the maximum measure of agreement between the members of the Committee. That

(Mr. Husain, India)

is then transmitted to the General Assembly. So the two are not on the same basis. When we are expressing the views of individual delegations in the report, it should be so signified. When we are giving the views of the entire Committee, it should also be so signified.

139. There has been much comment on whether or not the non-proliferation treaty is an important matter and whether or not some mention of it should be included in the report. So far as the delegation of India is concerned, as members are aware, the greatest importance is attached by the Government of India to the conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty. We did not agree with the text of the treaty in question, we had our reservations; but that does not mean that we do not regard the subject matter as important. It is an important subject matter. What I questioned was the need for mentioning it in the manner in which it has been mentioned in the report.

140. This report must take into consideration the reservations made by several members of this Committee; those reservations ought to be reflected in the report. The General Assembly should not be given the impression that all the seventeen members are agreed on this subject. All the seventeen members are not agreed on this subject, and we should not give an erroneous impression to the General Assembly.

141. The CHAIRMAN (Brazil): I now wish to consult the Committee about our next meeting. The co-Chairmen have spoken about having a meeting of the Committee at 10.30 tomorrow morning. Does the Committee agree? Since there is no objection a meeting will be held tomorrow at 10.30 a.m.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 393rd meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador A.F. Azeredo da Silveira, representative of Brazil.

"Statements were made by the representatives of Canada, the United Arab Republic, India, the United States, the USSR, Poland, Italy, Sweden, Burma, Brazil and Nigeria.

"The delegation of Italy submitted a Working Paper on Underground Nuclear Explosions (ENDC/234).

"The delegations of Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden and the United Arab Republic submitted a Joint Memorandum on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (ENDC/235).

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Wednesday, 28 August 1968, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

